

Serial No.: 10/799,630
Docket No.: 101-1016
Amd. dated October 4, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of July 26, 2005

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 6, 10, 12, 24, and 25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant also notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that each of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement of May 9, 2005 have been considered.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 10-14, 18-22, and 24-26 have been amended. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Objections

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to "show every feature of the invention specified in the claims." See Office Action of July 26, 2005 page 2, item 1. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the primary and second coil of claim 22 must be shown or the feature cancelled from the claim. See Office Action of July 26, 2005 page 2, item 1.

Applicant has amended claim 22 to recite "a second DC-DC conversion circuit connected between the high voltage outputting circuit having first and second coils connected to the first ground potential." These features are illustrated in FIG. 6 of the specification. In particular, element 660 of FIG. 6, which is described in paragraph [0057] of the specification, shows the DC-DC conversion circuit as having a first and a second coil connected to the first ground potential (referred to as "1"). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Serial No.: 10/799,630
Docket No.: 101-1016
Amd. dated October 4, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of July 26, 2005

Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification under 35 CFR 1.75(d) (1) as allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter of claim 22. See Office Action of July 26, 2005 page 3, item 2. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the term "primary and secondary coils" is not supported by the specification. See Office Action of July 26, 2005 page 3, item 2.

As set forth above, Applicant has amended claim 22 to recite "a second DC-DC conversion circuit connected between the high voltage outputting circuit having first and second coils connected to the first ground potential." Element 660 in FIG. 6, which is described in paragraph [0057], shows a DC-DC conversion circuit having first and second coils connected to a first ground potential. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 22, as amended, is supported by the specification. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16-22, 26, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by admitted prior art of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these claims for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claims 1, 11, 18, and 26

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "a direct current power supplying circuit...generating a first direct current power not isolated from the first ground of the alternating current power, and a second direct current power isolated from the first ground of the alternating current power and with reference to a second ground that is electrically blocked from the first ground." Independent claims 11, 18, and 26 have been amended to recite similar features. Applicant respectfully submits that the admitted prior art does not disclose, teach, or suggest these features.

Serial No.: 10/799,630
Docket No.: 101-1016
Amd. dated October 4, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of July 26, 2005

Regarding the Office Action of July 26, 2005, at page 3, item 4, the Examiner takes the position that:

"The Prior Art discloses a high-efficiency power supply apparatus using a driving system driving a display panel, comprising a direct current power supplying circuit (120, 130, 140) to improve a power factor (130) by rectifying an alternating current power (110), and generating a direct current power (140) not isolated from the alternating current power (110), and a direct current power isolated (140) from the alternating current power (110); a display panel driving circuit (150) to generate various driving signals to drive the display panel with the non-isolated direct current power; and a video signal processing circuit (the specification page 1, [0008]) to perform a predetermined video signal processing to generate data to drive the display panel with the isolated direct current power(140)."

The Examiner apparently relies on a combination of the rectifier circuit 120, the power factor correction circuit 130, the first DC-DC conversion circuit 140-1, and the second DC-DC conversion circuit 140-2 illustrated in FIG. 1 of the specification to disclose "a direct current power supplying circuit," as recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention.

Applicant submits that the admitted prior art does not produce both "a first direct current power not isolated from the first ground of the alternating current power" and "a second direct current power isolated from the first ground of the alternating current power and with reference to a second ground that is electrically blocked from the first ground," as recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention.

The combination of the rectifier circuit 120, the power factor correction circuit 130, and the first and second DC-DC conversion circuits 140-1 and 140-2 of FIG. 1 is not the same as the "direct current power supplying circuit," as recited in claim 1. In particular, FIG. 1 does not disclose any information about the grounds of the respective outputs of the first and second DC-DC conversion circuits 140-1 and 140-2. Furthermore, the "Description of the Related Art" does not mention anything about ground potential or electrical isolation between ground potentials. FIG. 1 does not even show any distinction between the first DC-DC conversion circuit 140-1 and the second DC-DC conversion circuit 140-2. Thus, neither FIG. 1 itself nor the "Description of the Related Art" section of the specification disclose, teach, or suggest any reason why the

Serial No.: 10/799,630
Docket No.: 101-1016
Amd. dated October 4, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of July 26, 2005

grounds of the first and second DC-DC conversion circuits 140-1 and 140-2 might be different from each other. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the admitted prior art of FIG. 1 does not disclose "a direct current power supplying circuit...generating a first direct current power not isolated from the first ground of the alternating current power, and a second direct current power isolated from the first ground of the alternating current power and with reference to a second ground that is electrically blocked from the first ground," as recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention. Moreover, the admitted prior art of the present invention also does not disclose "a display panel driving circuit to generate various driving signals to drive the display panel with the first non-isolated direct current power" and "a video signal processing circuit to perform a predetermined video signal processing to generate data to drive the display panel with the second isolated direct current power," as recited in independent claim 1 of Applicant's invention.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in the prior art. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the...claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "The elements must be arranged as required by the claim..." In re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Accordingly, since the admitted prior art does not disclose every element as recited in independent claim 1, the admitted prior art can not be used to properly reject claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable over the admitted prior art and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim is earnestly solicited.

As discussed above, independent claims 11, 18, and 26 recite similar features to those recited in independent claim 1. For example, independent claims 11, 18, and 26 include the features of the first ground (first ground potential) and the second ground (second ground potential). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also patentable over the admitted prior art for at least the reasons set forth with regard to independent claim 1.

Serial No.: 10/799,630
Docket No.: 101-1016
Amd. dated October 4, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of July 26, 2005

Dependent Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 19-22, and 27

It is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons that each of claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 19-22, and 27 depend from one of independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 26, claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, 19-22, and 27 each contain the respective features of independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 26, and are therefore also patentable over the admitted prior art, and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the present application in view of U.S. Publication No. 20050018455 to Ceruti. Claims 5 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the present application in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,222 to Liang. Claims 9, 15 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art of the present application in view of Japanese Publication No. 2000-350697A to Niida.

Each of these dependent claims depends from and adds additional features to one of independent claims 1, 11, 18, and 26. As discussed above, the admitted prior art does not disclose each of the features recited in the independent claims and, thus, necessarily fails to disclose, teach, or suggest each of the features in the dependent claims. None of the references relied upon by the Examiner, alone or in combination with one another, compensates for the deficiencies of the admitted prior art discussed above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are also patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Allowed Claims

Dependent claims 6, 10, 12, 24, and 25 have been objected to as being allowable if rewritten in independent claim form.

Serial No.: 10/799,630
Docket No.: 101-1016
Amd. dated October 4, 2005
Reply to the Office Action of July 26, 2005

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP



By: _____
Daniel E. Valencia
Registration No. 56,463

Dated: October 4, 2005
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, D.C. 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901